Andrew M. Schpak, OSB No. 044080 aschpak@barran.com
Kyle Abraham, OSB No. 051821 kabraham@barran.com
BARRAN LIEBMAN LLP
601 SW Second Ave., Suite 2300
Portland, Oregon 97204-3159
Telephone: (503) 228-0500

Facsimile: (503) 274-1212

Attorneys for Defendant NuView Systems, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF OREGON EUGENE DIVISION

LAURA DE BLOCK,		6:12-CV-1008-AA
v. NUVIEW SYSTEMS, INC.,	Plaintiff,	DEFENDANT'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL
	Defendant.	

The following is Defendant's Memorandum in Support of Motion to Compel production of certain documents in the above-referenced action.

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff has filed the above-referenced action raising the following claims: (1) Disability discrimination pursuant to Title I of the Americans Disabilities Act ("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. §12101

Page 1 – DEFENDANT'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL

et seq; (2) Failure to accommodate pursuant to Title V of the ADA; and (3) Retaliation for

complaining about Defendant's alleged failure to accommodate.

Defendant served its First Request for Production of Documents and its First Set of

Interrogatories on Plaintiff via email and regular mail on November 8, 2012. (Schpak Decl., Exs

A, B). Defendant requested documents that are relevant to this action and are reasonably

calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Plaintiff's response was due on

December 11, 2012.

On January 2, 2013, counsel for Defendant contacted Plaintiff via email regarding her

failure to respond to the discovery request. (Schpak Decl., Ex C). On January 5, 2013, Plaintiff

replied and stated she was "planning on responding to [Defendant's] request as soon as possible"

and that she was "waiting for a response from a lawyer in order to respond properly." (Id). On

January 11, 2013, counsel for Defendant again contacted Plaintiff via email to ascertain the

status of her response to Defendant's discovery request. (Id.). On January 13, 2013, over a

month after the original deadline to respond, Plaintiff asked for a 30-day extension on her

response to Defendant's discovery request. (Id.). Defendant agreed to extend the deadline by

two weeks, until January 30, 2013. (Id.). Counsel for Defendant explained any longer delay

would be too close to the discovery cutoff date, which is February 28, 2013. As of February 4,

2013, Plaintiff has failed to object or otherwise respond to Defendant's discovery requests.

(Schpak Decl., ¶5).

DISCUSSION

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(1), parties may discover any relevant,

unprivileged information that is admissible at trial or is reasonably calculated to lead to

admissible evidence. Tran v. Tyco Electronics, Corp., 06-CV-1810-BR, 2008 WL 2037279 (D.

Page 2 – DEFENDANT'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL

BARRAN LIEBMAN LLP 601 SW SECOND AVENUE, SUITE 2300 PORTLAND, OR 97204-3159 PHONE (503) 228-0500 FAX (503) 274-1212 Or. May 7, 2008). In this case, Plaintiff's complaint alleges Defendant's actions were

discriminatory in violation of the ADA. Based on these allegations, Defendant requested

information from Plaintiff that supports her claims. Defendant did not submit a "boilerplate"

request for production; rather, Defendant's request identified specific documents. Likewise,

Defendant's interrogatories were tailored to address specific facts alleged by Plaintiff in her

complaint. Defendant requested information relevant to this action and reasonably calculated to

lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

In spite of Defendant's good faith efforts to obtain the information identified above,

Plaintiff has failed to respond to the requests for production or the interrogatories. Ultimately,

Plaintiff refused to produce any documents responsive to these requests for production.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the medical and mental health documents requested by

Defendants are reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and

Plaintiff should be ordered to produce the requested documents.

DATED this 6th day of February, 2013.

BARRAN LIEBMAN LLP

s/Andrew M. Schpak

By

Andrew M. Schpak, OSB No. 044080

aschpak@barran.com

Kyle Abraham, OSB No. 051821

kabraham@barran.com

Attorneys for Defendant NuView Systems, Inc.

Page 3 – DEFENDANT'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 6th day of February, 2013, I served the foregoing **DEFENDANT'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL** on the following parties at the following addresses:

Laura De Block 19624 Apache Rd. Bend, Oregon 97702 ldeblock306@gmail.com

Plaintiff Pro Se

by the following indicated method or methods on the date set forth above:

$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	Electronic Filing			
	Facsimile			
	First-class mail, postage prepaid			
	Hand-delivery			
	Email			
	s/Andrew M. Schpak			
	Andrew M. Schpak			

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE